

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~  
~~ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNAL USE ONLY~~

## MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS FOR DDR&amp;E

5 February 1987

Highlighted 7 Apr 87

25X1

Assumed Charter: Generally oversee the work of the present DCI Collection and Production Committees (including the FLC and IDC, but not the IHC) and consolidate the present functions of the Intelligence Producers Council staff, the CIPC, and the FIPC with the following goals: (1) Maintain an authoritative statement of current and future intelligence requirements binding throughout the Community, and (2) Provide D/ICS evaluations of how well current and future collection and analysis is meeting or will meet these requirements. The resources available to the DDR&E would be the ICS personnel and office space presently assigned or detailed to these committees.

Organizational proposals:

1. Form a Requirements and Evaluation Staff (RES) using the billets assigned to the IPC, CIPC, and FIPC staffs. The director of this staff would be tasked to (a) coordinate DDR&E's relations with the chairmen of the above DCI committees and the IPC, and (b) manage the RES. Comment: D/RES, who would have a dozen GG-13/15 staff officers and a half-dozen senior secretaries at his or her disposal, should have the option of redividing this staff for administrative convenience, say into a requirements group and an evaluation group. Though awkward in some respects, part of the RES could remain at CIA Hqs, where it would be easier to support the IPC and work with the NIC and those DCI substantive committees that will continue to meet there.

→ 2. Recommend to the IPC that they extend membership to senior consumers, so as to provide an authoritative channel short of NFIB/NFIC and SIG(I) for intelligence consumers to express their needs, voice complaints openly, and bring home more effectively the competitive nature of their requirements. Issues that we wish to keep within the major intelligence producing components could still be treated in separate sessions or, better yet, delegated to a DCI committee. The middle name of the council could conveniently become "production." Presume DDR&E would wish to chair, co-chair (with ADDI), or serve as vice chairman of the IPC and that the ICS/RES would assume secretariat services.

see #2 3. Recommend to the CIPC that it disestablish itself, offering IPC membership to those organizations who wish to be represented in senior community fora and FIPC membership (if any are not already represented) for those wishing working-level involvement in the formulation of requirements. Provision of ad hoc working group chairmen and members, if needed for certain Community evaluations, would be requested through the IPC.

see #2 4. Recommend to the FIPC that it maintain <sup>or</sup> its present basic membership, but be prepared to somewhat expand in size or level of representation to accommodate Community components now represented on the CIPC if the IPC does not expand to include consumer components. Its responsibilities would be extended in any case to include preparation of the overarching statement of current and future requirements satisfactory to the D/ICS; the ICS/RES would provide increased secretariat services.

~~CONFIDENTIAL - INTERNAL ADMINISTRATIVE USE ONLY~~

Operational Proposals:

- 1. Consolidate the FIRCAP, the NITs, and the draft Compendium of Future Intelligence Requirements into a single annually-updated statement, perhaps to be called simply National Intelligence Requirements. To be both useful and authoritative throughout the Community, I recommend a two-part document: a narrative statement short enough to be read and used by the Senior Officials of the Intelligence Community in making informed decisions defensible to Congress and Executive branch policymakers, and a tabular annex detailed enough to provide useful guidance to collection and analytic managers within the Community. I would suggest that the FIRCAP be used as the foundation document for the annex, modified to indicate the topics of keen current interest (replacing the NITs) to guide analytic production plans and including projections of future priorities (replacing a the FIRF) to guide outyear planning for systems and personnel requirements (the FIRCAP is already providing appropriate standing guidance to the DCI Collection Committees and Community component agencies). The narrative portion can be written simultaneously to capture the main points in the tables and ensure consistency with the various guidance papers agreed to over the past year or so by NFIB or NFIC. Differences of opinion that cannot be resolved by FIPC should be referred to the IPC before D/ICS submits the completed document (narrative summary only) to the DCI for consideration by NFIB/NFIC.
- 2. Evaluate the impact on customer satisfaction of initiatives proposed for Community endorsement. I would envision DDR&E being asked by D/ICS to evaluate the expected intelligence value of costly or otherwise problematic program initiatives, the adverse effect on intelligence capabilities expected from specific budget cuts or policy changes, and other proposed changes where the DCI may need an independent source of advice (the other elements of the ICS should be encouraged to identify candidate topics for evaluation). In addition to tasked evaluations, the Chairmen of the Collection and Production Committees and RES members should be encouraged to propose similar evaluations of specific topics that cut across collection disciplines, substantive or target lines. DDR&E may wish to offer objective cross-disciplinary evaluations keyed to closing serious intelligence gaps identified by C/NIC or individual NIOs. Followup evaluations of D/ICS-approved recommendations to ensure compliance (as the CIPC did with its own reports), are often worthwhile and enhance the effectiveness of the original recommendations. Each evaluation should have a specific purpose, which should dictate its format (briefing, memorandum, or formal publication) and method of preparation. Depending upon its scope and deadline, the DDR&E could assign the task to one of the existing DCI Committees, ask the IPC, (CIPC), or FIPC to form an ad hoc working group, or assign one or more members of the RES to conduct an internal ICS evaluation; the ToR and the final evaluation would be referred to D/ICS for approval.
- 3. Coordinate the publication plans of the DCI Collection and Production Committees. This would help ensure consistency with ICS evaluations and provide insight into the continued utility of some of the subcommittees and working groups; a listing should be circulated throughout the Community (as the NIC does with its plans).

ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNAL USE ONLY  
CONFIDENTIAL

#### **Implementation Plan**

- o Clear concept with DD/R&E designate
- o D/ICS and/or DD/ICS discuss concept with Community principals and proposed members of CREC
- o Make staff changes especially designation of Requirements and Evaluation Staff
- o Redistribute billets and office space
- o Kick off Action Plan on or about 15 January 1987